

Case No. 7:06-cv-1625
Gwin, J.

July 15, 2010. [Doc. 72.] The Plaintiffs oppose the Defendants' motion and argue that they will be prejudiced by any further delay in the production of the emails. [Doc. 73.]

The Court **GRANTS** the Defendant's motion for an extension of time to produce these responsive emails and **ORDERS** that the Defendants continue to produce emails on a rolling basis and complete the production of emails by July 15, 2010. The Court will grant no further extensions and failure to comply with this order could result in the imposition of sanctions.

Disclosure of Expert Reports

On June 21, 2010, the Defendants again wrote to the Court, requesting an extension of time to produce the expert report of their forensic handwriting expert. [Doc. 74.] The Court earlier ordered that expert reports be exchanged ninety days before trial, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(C)(i). The Defendants requested a two-week extension of time to produce their expert report. [Doc. 74.] The Plaintiffs do not oppose the Defendants' motion and also request an extension of time in which to file their expert report, until two-weeks after the completion of the Plaintiffs' depositions. [Doc. 77.]

The Court **GRANTS** the Defendants' motion for an extension of time to produce their expert's report. If they have not done so already, the Defendants shall make this disclosure by **Friday, July 9, 2010**. The Court also **GRANTS** the Plaintiffs' motion for an extension of time, and orders that the Plaintiffs make their expert disclosure by **Friday, July 16, 2010**.

Plaintiffs' Responses to Interrogatories

Finally, the Defendants also wrote to the Court on July 21, 2010, requesting that the Court order the Plaintiffs to supplement their answers to the Defendants' First Set of Interrogatories. [Doc. 75.] The Defendants complain that the Plaintiffs objected to several of the interrogatories as

Case No. 7:06-cv-1625
Gwin, J.

“overbroad, unduly burdensome, and not permitted by Rule 33.3 of the Local Civil Rules.” The Plaintiffs oppose the Defendants’ motion and continue to allege that the interrogatories are improper under Rule 33.3. [Doc. 76.]

The Court sustains the Plaintiff’s objections to the Defendants’ Interrogatories Numbers 3-19 as improper under Local Civil Rule 33.3. The Defendants seek information beyond the scope of that allowed by Local Civil Rule 33.3(a) and have not shown that interrogatories are a more practical method of obtaining this information than, for example, depositions, as required by Local Civil Rule 33.3(b). Moreover, the Court finds that certain of the Defendants’ interrogatories are improper as prematurely filed contention interrogatories under Local Civil Rule 33.3(c).

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the Defendants’ motion to order the Plaintiffs to supplement their responses to the interrogatories. The Defendants may prepare and serve new interrogatories on the Plaintiffs that conform to the requirements of Local Rule 33.3.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: July 7, 2010


s/ JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE